20

22

23

24

25

27

firm.

```
STEPHEN H. TURNER, SB# 89627
E-Mail: turner@lbbslaw.com
    LEWIS BRISBOIS BISGAARD & SMITH LLP
    221 North Figueroa Street, Suite 1200
    Los Angeles, California 90012
Telephone: (213) 250-1800
Facsimile: (213) 250-7900
ROGER S. RAPHAEL, SB #111946
 4
    E-Mail: raphael@lbbslaw.com
 5
    LEWIS BRISBOIS BISGAARD & SMITH LLP
    One Sansome Street, Suite 1400
    San Francisco, California 94104
    Telephone: (415) 362-2580 Facsimile: (415) 434-0882
 8
    Attorneys for Defendants Patenaude & Felix, APC
 9
10
                            UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
11
                          NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
12
13
    EMELIA M. PASTERNAK,
                                                  CASE NO. 3:07-cv-04980 MJJ
14
                  Plaintiff,
                                                  The Hon. Martin J. Jenkins
15
           v.
16
                                                  ANSWER OF PATENAUDE &
                                                  FELIX, APC TO FIRST AMENDED
    TRANS UNION, LLC, EXPERIAN INFORMATION SOLUTIONS, INC.,
                                                  COMPLAINT
     EQUIFAX INFORMATION
    SERVICES, LLC, CAPITAL ONE BANK, a national association, and
                                                  ACTION FILED:
                                                                            September 26,
18
```

Defendants. 21

PATENAUDE & FELIX, APC, a law

DEFENDANT PATENAUDE & FELIX, APC. ("Defendant"), for itself and for no other defendant, answers the First Amended Complaint as follows:

TRIAL DATE:

N/A

Answering paragraph No. 1, Defendant has insufficient information and 1. belief on which to admit or deny the allegations contained herein and on that basis denies each and every allegation.

28 ///

9

LEWIS BRISBOIS BISGAARD & SMITH LLP

24

111

///

4830-4942-2338.1

- Answering paragraph No. 2, Defendant has insufficient information and 2. belief on which to admit or deny the allegations contained herein and on that basis denies each and every allegation.
- Answering paragraph No. 3, Defendant has insufficient information and 3. belief on which to admit or deny the allegations contained herein and on that basis denies each and every allegation.
- Answering paragraph No. 4, Defendant has insufficient information and 4. belief on which to admit or deny the allegations contained herein and on that basis denies each and every allegation.
- Answering paragraph No. 5, Defendant denies that it violated the Fair 5. Debt Collection Practices Act.
- Answering paragraph No. 6, Defendant denies it violated California's 6. Anti Theft Statute. Defendant lacks sufficient information and belief on which to either admit or deny each and every allegation in paragraph 6.
- Answering paragraph No. 7, Defendant denies it is liable for malicious 7. prosecution, or for any other basis. Plaintiff lacks sufficient information and belief on which to admit or deny any other allegation in paragraph 7.
- Answering paragraph No. 8, Defendant has insufficient information and 8. belief on which to admit or deny the allegations contained herein and on that basis denies each and every allegation.
- Answering paragraph No. 9, Defendant has insufficient information and 9. belief on which to admit or deny the allegations contained herein and on that basis denies each and every allegation.
- Answering paragraph No. 10, Defendant has insufficient information 10. and belief on which to admit or deny the allegations contained herein and on that basis denies each and every allegation.

-2-

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

	11.	Answe	ering para	igraph No.	11, De	fenda	ent ha	s ins	ufficie	nt info	ormati	on
and b	elief o	n which	n to admit	t or deny tl	he alleg	ation	s con	taine	d here	in and	on th	at
basis	denies	each a	nd every	allegation.								
	10	4		1 37	10 D	c 1	. •				. •	

- Answering paragraph No. 12, Defendant has insufficient information 12. and belief in which to admit or deny the allegations contained herein and on that basis denies each and every allegation.
- Answering paragraph No. 13, Defendant has insufficient information 13. and belief in which to admit or deny the allegations contained herein and on that basis denies each and every allegation.
- Answering paragraph No. 14, Defendant admits that it has an office in 14. San Diego.
- Answering paragraph No. 15, Defendant incorporates paragraphs 1-14 15. of this answer as if set forth at length.
- Answering paragraph No. 16, Defendant notes that the first claim for 16. relief is not directed to it.
- Answering paragraph No. 17, Defendant notes that the first claim for 17. relief is not directed to it.
- Answering paragraph No. 18, Defendant notes that the first claim for 18. relief is not directed to it.
- Answering paragraph No. 19, Defendant notes that the first claim for 19. relief is not directed to it.
- Answering paragraph No. 20, Defendant notes that the first claim for 20. relief is not directed to it.
- Answering paragraph No. 21, Defendant notes that the first claim for 21. relief is not directed to it.
- Answering paragraph No. 22, Defendant notes that the first claim for 22. relief is not directed to it.

28

///

7

LEWIS BRISBOIS BISGAARD & SMITH LLP

- Answering paragraph No. 23, Defendant notes that the first claim for 23. relief is not directed to it.
- Answering paragraph No. 24, Defendant notes that the first claim for 24. relief is not directed to it.
- Answering paragraph No. 25, Defendant notes that the first claim for 25. relief is not directed to it.
- Answering paragraph No. 26, Defendant notes that the first claim for 26. relief is not directed to it.
- Answering paragraph No. 27, Defendant notes that the first claim for 27. relief is not directed to it.
- 28. Answering paragraph No. 28, Defendant incorporates paragraphs 1 through 14 of this answer as if set forth at length.
- Answering paragraph No. 29, Defendant notes that the second claim for 29. relief is not directed to it.
- Answering paragraph No. 30, Defendant notes that the second claim for 30. relief is not directed to it.
- Answering paragraph No. 31, Defendant notes that the second claim for 31. relief is not directed to it.
- Answering paragraph No. 32, Defendant notes that the second claim for 32. relief is not directed to it.
- Answering paragraph No. 33, Defendant notes that the second claim for 33. relief is not directed to it.
- Answering paragraph No. 34, Defendant notes that the second claim for 34. relief is not directed to it.
- Answering paragraph No. 35, Defendant notes that the second claim for 35. relief is not directed to it.
- Answering paragraph No. 36, Defendant notes that the second claim for 36. relief is not directed to it.

5

11

15

LEWIS BRISBOIS BISGAARD & SMITH LLP

- Answering paragraph No. 37, Defendant notes that the second claim for 37. relief is not directed to it.
- Answering paragraph No. 38, Defendant incorporates paragraphs 1-14 38. of this answer as if set forth at length.
- Answering paragraph No. 39, Defendant notes that the third claim for 39. relief is not directed to it.
- Answering paragraph No. 40, Defendant notes that the third claim for 40. relief is not directed to it.
- Answering paragraph No. 41, Defendant notes that the third claim for 41. relief is not directed to it.
- Answering paragraph No. 42, Defendant notes that the third claim for 42. relief is not directed to it.
- Answering paragraph No. 43, Defendant notes that the third claim for 43. relief is not directed to it.
- Answering paragraph No. 44, Defendant notes that the third claim for relief is not directed to it.
- Answering paragraph No. 45, Defendant notes that the third claim for 45. relief is not directed to it.
- Answering paragraph No. 46, Defendant notes that the third claim for 46. relief is not directed to it.
- Answering paragraph No. 47, Defendant notes that the third claim for 47. relief is not directed to it.
- Answering paragraph No. 48, Defendant incorporates paragraphs 1 48. through 14 of this answer as if set forth at length.
- Answering paragraph No. 49, Defendant admits that it is a law firm 49. which has an office in San Diego. Defendant admits each and every other allegation.
- Answering paragraph No. 50, Defendant admits each and every 50. allegation.

ELEPHONE (213) 250-1800

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

- 51. Answering paragraph No. 51, Defendant lacks sufficient information and belief in which to either admit or deny the allegations contained therein and on that basis denies each and every allegation.
- 52. Answering paragraph No. 52, Defendant lacks sufficient information and belief in which to either admit or deny the allegations contained therein and on that basis denies each and every allegation.
- Answering paragraph No. 53 and each subparagraph therein, Defendant 53. denies each and every allegation.
- Answering paragraph No. 54, Defendant has insufficient information 54. and belief on which to admit or deny the allegations contained herein and on that basis denies each and every allegation.
- Answering paragraph No. 55, Defendant denies each and every 55. allegation contained therein and further denies that it is liable in any way to Plaintiff.
- Answering paragraph No. 56, Defendant has insufficient information 56. and belief on which to admit or deny the allegations contained herein and on that basis denies each and every allegation.
- Answering paragraph No. 57, Defendant has insufficient information 57. and belief on which to admit or deny the allegations contained herein and on that basis denies each and every allegation.
- Answering paragraph No. 58, Defendant has insufficient information 58. and belief in which to admit or deny the allegations contained herein and on that basis denies each and every allegation.
- Answering paragraph No. 59, Defendant has insufficient information 59. and belief in which to admit or deny the allegations contained herein and on that basis denies each and every allegation.
- Answering paragraph No. 60, Defendant has insufficient information 60. and belief in which to admit or deny the allegations contained herein and on that basis denies each and every allegation.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

- 61. Answering paragraph No. 61, Defendant denies that it received a copy of a police report from plaintiff. As to the remaining allegations in the complaint, defendant has has insufficient information and belief on which to admit or deny the allegations contained herein and on that basis denies each and every allegation.
- Answering paragraph No. 62, Defendant denies it failed to diligently 62. investigate Plaintiff's notification of identity theft. Defendant lacks sufficient information and belief on which to either admit or deny each and every other allegation and on that basis denies each and every allegation.
- Answering paragraph No. 63, Defendant denies it failed to diligently investigate Plaintiff's notification of identity theft. Defendant lacks sufficient information and belief on which to either admit or deny each and every other allegation and on that basis denies each and every allegation.
- Answering paragraph No. 64, Defendant denies that it has damaged 64. plaintiff in any manner whatsoever or that she is entitled to recover any damages from defendant. Defendant lacks sufficient information and belief on which to admit or deny the remaining allegations and on that basis denies each and every allegation.
- Answering paragraph No. 65, Defendant lacks sufficient information 65. and belief on which to admit or deny the allegations contained therein and on that basis denies each and every allegation.
- 66. Answering paragraph No. 66, Defendant denies that it lacks probable cause to believe Plaintiff is liable for the account. As to the remaining allegations, Defendant lacks sufficient information and belief to either admit or deny the allegations and on that basis denies each allegation.
- 67. Answering paragraph No. 67, Defendant denies each and every allegation as it pertains to Defendant. As to the remaining allegations, Defendant lacks sufficient information and belief on which to either admit or deny the allegations and on that basis denies every allegation.

EET, SUITE 1200	VIA 90012-2601	250-1800	
11 NORTH FIGUEROA STREET, SUITE 1200	LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA 90012-2601	TELEPHONE (213) 250-1800	

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

	68.	Answering paragraph No. 68, Defendant has insufficient information
and	belief o	n which to admit or deny the allegations contained herein and on that
basi	is denies	each and every allegation.

- 69. Answering paragraph No. 69, Defendant has insufficient information and belief on which to admit or deny the allegations contained herein and on that basis denies each and every allegation.
- 70. Answering paragraph No. 70, Defendant has insufficient information and belief on which to admit or deny the allegations contained herein and on that basis denies each and every allegation.
- 71. Answering paragraph No. 71, Defendant has insufficient information and belief on which to admit or deny the allegations contained herein and on that basis denies each and every allegation.
- 72. Answering paragraph No. 72, Defendant denies each and every allegation as it pertains to Defendant. As to the remaining allegations, Defendant lacks sufficient information and belief on which to admit or deny the allegations and on that basis denies each and every allegation.
- 73. Answering paragraph No. 73, Defendant denies it has damaged Plaintiff in any way whatsoever.

## FIRST AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

1. As a separate, affirmative defense, Defendant alleges that the Complaint, and each and every purported cause of action contained therein, fails to state facts sufficient to constitute a cause of action.

# **SECOND AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE**

2. As a separate, affirmative defense, Defendant alleges that the alleged actions of Defendant were proper and did not violate any provisions of 15 U.S.C. §1692 et. seq.

27 | / / /

28 | ///

LEWIS BRISBOIS BISGAARD & SMITH LLP

## THIRD AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

3. As a separate, affirmative defense, Defendant alleges that at all times mentioned in the Complaint, Defendant acted lawfully and within its legal rights, with a good faith belief in the exercise of that right, and in the furtherance of a legitimate business purpose. Further, Defendant acted in good faith in the honest belief that the acts, conduct and communications, if any, of the Defendant were justified under the circumstances based on information reasonably available to this answering Defendant.

#### FOURTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

4. As a separate, affirmative defense, Defendant alleges that the alleged actions of the Defendant were not accompanied by actual malice, intent or ill will.

#### FIFTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

5. As a separate, affirmative defense, Defendant allege that Defendant's conduct, communications and actions, if any, were privileged.

## SIXTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

6. As a separate, affirmative defense, assuming arguendo that this Defendant violated a statute alleged in the complaint, which presupposition the Defendant denies, such violation was not intentional and resulted from a bona fide error, notwithstanding the maintenance of procedures reasonably adapted to avoid any such error.

## SEVENTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

7. As a separate, affirmative defense, Defendant alleges that Plaintiff is barred from any recovery against this answering Defendant by the doctrine of laches.

# EIGHTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

8. As a separate, affirmative defense, Defendants allege that its conduct, communications and actions, if any, were privileged pursuant to Civil Code §§1785.32 and 47.

///

8

6

LEWIS BRISBOIS BISGAARD & SMITH LLP

26

28

## NINTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

9. As a separate, affirmative defense, Defendant alleges that they, at all times alleged in the complaint, maintained reasonable procedures created to prevent any type of intentional violations of the Fair Debt Collection Practices Act.

### TENTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

10. As a separate, affirmative defense, Defendant alleges that if Plaintiff was damaged in any sum or sums alleged, which Defendant denies, then Plaintiff's damages are limited by 15 U.S.C.  $\S1692(k)(a)(1)$ ,  $\S1692(k)(a)(2)(A)$ ,  $\S1692(k)(a)(3)$ and 15 U.S.C. § 1692(k)(b)(1).

#### ELEVENTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

As a separate, affirmative defense, Defendant alleges that 11. Defendant's conduct, communications and actions, if any, were privileged pursuant to 15 U.S.C. §1692(k)(c).

#### TWELFTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

12. As a separate, affirmative defense, Defendant alleges that the alleged actions of Defendant were proper and did not violate any provisions of Cal. Civ. Code § 1788, et seq.

## THIRTEENTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

13. As a separate, affirmative defense, Defendant alleges that the alleged actions of the Defendant was privileged pursuant to Federal and State Common Law.

## FOURTEENTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

As a separate, affirmative defense, Defendant alleges that if Plaintiff was damaged in any sum or sums alleged, which Defendant denies, Plaintiff failed to mitigate her damages.

## FIFTEENTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

As a separate, affirmative defense, Defendant alleges that if Plaintiff 15. was damaged in any sum or sums alleged, which Defendant denies, Defendant's alleged acts or omissions were not a proximate cause of said damages.

LEWIS BRISBOIS BISGAARD & SMITH LLP

WHEREFORE, this answering Defendant prays,

- For a judgment in favor of Defendant, and against Plaintiff, and that Plaintiff take nothing by reason of said Complaint;
- 2. That this answering Defendant be awarded cost of suit herein and such other further relief as the Court deems just.

DATED: January 10, 2008

STEPHEN H. TURNER LEWIS BRISBOIS BISGAARD & SMITH LLP

for Defendants Patenaude & Felix,

LEWIS BRISBOIS BISGAARD & SMITH LLP

2

4

5

6

8

10

1112

13

14

15 16

10

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

# **CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

I certify that on the 10<sup>th</sup> day of January, 2008, I electronically transmitted the foregoing document to the Clerk's office using the CM/ECF System for filing and transmittal of a Notice of Electronic Filing to the following CM/ECF registrants:

Andrew J. Ogilvie, Esq. Attorney for Plaintiff Emelia M. Pasternak

Thomas P. Quinn, Esq. Attorney for Defendant Equifax

Donald E. Bradley, Esq. Attorney for Defendant Trans Union

David L. Wallach, Esq. Attorney for Defendant Experian

Veronica Kuiumdjian, Esq. Attorney for Defendant Capital One Bank

By: /s/ Stephen H. Turner

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

18

19

20

21

22

23

25

26

EMELIA M. PASTERNAK,

Plaintiff,

v.

TRANS UNION, LLC, EXPERIAN INFORMATION SOLUTIONS, INC., EQUIFAX INFORMATION SERVICES, LLC, CAPITAL ONE BANK, a national association, and PATENAUDE & FELIX, APC, a law firm,

Defendants.

STEPHEN H. TURNER, SB# 89627

221 North Figueroa Street, Suite 1200

Los Angeles, California 90012 Telephone: (213) 250-1800 Facsimile: (213) 250-7900 ROGER S. RAPHAEL, SB #111946

LEWIS BRISBOIS BISGAARD & SMITH LLP

LEWIS BRISBOIS BISGAARD & SMITH LLP

Attorneys for Defendant Patenaude & Felix, APC

E-Mail: turner@lbbslaw.com

E-Mail: raphael@lbbslaw.com

One Sansome Street, Suite 1400 San Francisco, California 94104

Telephone: (415) 362-2580 Facsimile: (415) 434-0882

CASE NO. 3:07-cv-04980 MJJ

The Hon. Martin J. Jenkins

CERTIFICATE OF INTERESTED PARTIES

**ACTION FILED:** 

September 26, 2007

TRIAL DATE:

N/A

The undersigned, counsel of record for Defendant Patenaude & Felix, APC certifies that the following listed parties have a direct, pecuniary interest in the outcome of this case. These representations are made to enable the Court to evaluate possible disqualification or recusal.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

27 | ///

28 | ///

4811-9350-8866.1

EMELIA M. PASTERNAK	Plaintiff
TRANS UNION, LLC	Defendant
EXPERIAN INFORMATION	Defendant
SOLUTIONS, INC	
EQUIFAX INFORMATION	Defendant
SERVICES, LLC	
CAPITAL ONE BANK	Defendant
PATENAUDE & FELIX, APC	Defendant

DATED: January, 2008

STEPHEN H. TURNER LEWIS BRISBOIS BISGAARD & SMITH LLP

Senten H Turner

Attorneys for Defendant Patenaude & Felix,

APG

LEWIS BRISBOIS BISGAARD & SMITH LLP

**CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE** 

I certify that on the 10<sup>th</sup> day of January, 2008, I electronically transmitted the foregoing document to the Clerk's office using the CM/ECF System for filing and transmittal of a Notice of Electronic Filing to the following CM/ECF registrants:

Andrew J. Ogilvie, Esq. Attorney for Plaintiff Emelia M. Pasternak

Thomas P. Quinn, Esq. Attorney for Defendant Equifax

Donald E. Bradley, Esq. Attorney for Defendant Trans Union

David L. Wallach, Esq. Attorney for Defendant Experian

Veronica Kuiumdjian, Esq. Attorney for Defendant Capital One Bank

By: /s/ Stephen H. Turner